

Remarks

Entry of the amendments, reconsideration of the application, as amended, and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested. Upon entry of the amendments, claims 1-15 and 31-33 are pending.

Support for the amendments can be found throughout applicants' specification. For instance, support for dependent claim 32 can be found at least in paragraphs 48, 53 and 55 of applicants' specification; and support for claim 33 can be found in at least paragraphs 48 and 50 of applicants' specification. Therefore, no new matter is added.

In the Office Action, dated October 9, 2008, claims 1-6, 8-15, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siamak et al. (EP 0969,371) in view of Carlson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,133,907) and further in view of Brown Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 7,177,920); and claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siamak et al. in view of Carlson et al. and further in view of Brown Jr. and further in view of Wilson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,454). Applicants respectfully, but most strenuously, traverse these rejections for the reasons below.

In accordance with an aspect of the present invention, a capability is provided for facilitating the configuring of communications environments. In one example, logical CHPID numbers are assigned to physical channels in a manner that minimizes single points of failure or single points of repair. An automatic linkage of a logical definition of a channel to a physical channel is selected that best exploits the reliability, availability, and serviceability of an environment. Advantageously, the assignments can be made prior to the machine being installed or the I/O being installed.

In one particular example, applicants claim a method of facilitating configuring of resources of a communications environment (e.g., independent claim 1). The method includes, for instance, automatically mapping a first identifier of a resource of a machine being configured to a second identifier of the resource to assign a physical path of the resource to a logical path of the resource, wherein the automatically mapping is performed prior to installation of the machine, and wherein the first identifier is usable by hardware to identify the resource and the

second identifier is usable by a program of the machine to identify the resource, and wherein the mapping is based on the physical structure of the machine being configured and on avoiding single points of failure or single points of repair.

Thus, in this aspect of applicants' claimed invention, a first identifier of a resource of a machine being configured is mapped to a second identifier of the resource to assign a physical path of the resource to a logical path of that resource. This mapping is based on the physical structure of the machine being configured and on avoiding single points of failure or single points of repair. Further, this automatic mapping is performed prior to installation of the machine. This is not described, taught or suggested in Siamak, Carlson, or Brown, either alone or in combination.

Siamak reads device identifiers from storage devices in a computer system and uses the device identifiers to create a mapping associating the device identifiers with corresponding physical paths to the storage devices. Upon reconfiguration of the storage devices, the computer system again reads device identifiers from storage devices in order to verify that that the system was reconfigured correctly. So, in Siamak when there is a reconfiguration, the system uses a mapping file to determine if there was a mistake made during the reconfiguration. There is, however, no description, teaching or suggestion in Siamak of mapping logical identifiers to physical identifiers, wherein the mapping is based on avoiding single points of failure or single points of repair, as claimed by applicants. Siamak makes no reference to single points of failure or single points of repair in describing or creating its mapping table (see, e.g., paragraphs 19-24 of Siamak).

Since Siamak fails to disclose at least applicants' claimed element of automatically mapping a first identifier based on the physical structure of a machine being configured and on avoiding single points of failure or single points of repair, as explicitly admitted in the Office Action, Carlson is relied upon. However, Carlson does not overcome the deficiencies of Siamak.

While Carlson describes configuring system resources, there is no description, teaching or suggestion in Carlson of automatically mapping identifiers. Further, there is no description, teaching or suggestion in Carlson of automatically mapping identifiers based on the physical structure of a machine being configured and on avoiding single points of failure or single points

of repair. Since both Siamak and Carlson fail to describe, teach or suggest this aspect of applicants' claimed invention, applicants respectfully submit that the combination also fails to describe, teach or suggest this aspect.

It is stated in the Office Action that Carlson discloses mapping of a machine to avoid a single point of failure as indicated in FIG. 2, col. 7, lines 1-39. While Carlson describes configuring redundant paths through a switch to a storage space to avoid a single point of failure, Carlson does not describe, teach or suggest automatically mapping a first identifier of a resource of a machine being configured to a second identifier of the resource to assign a physical path to a logical path, wherein the mapping is based on the physical structure of the machine being configured and on avoiding single points of failure or single points of repair. There is no discussion in Carlson of mapping identifiers, and in particular, of mapping identifiers to avoid single points of failure. Even though Carlson mentions the avoidance of single points of failure, there is no correlation between that and in mapping identifiers in order to avoid single points of failure. Carlson, like Siamak, fails to describe, teach or suggest a technique for automatically mapping identifiers that avoid single points of failure, as claimed by applicants.

The combination of Siamak and Carlson, *assuming arguendo* the combination is proper, merely describes that an identifier may be mapped, and that resources may be configured to provide redundancy. However, there is no correlation between the two in the combination. The combination does not suggest that the mapping of an identifier is based on the physical structure of the machine being configured and on avoiding single points of failure or single points of repair. The combination simply indicates that identifiers may be mapped in some fashion, and that resources can be configured to provide redundancy. To indicate that the combined teachings describe what is claimed by applicants is hindsight reconstruction of applicants' invention.

Further, Brown also fails to describe, teach or suggest at least this aspect of applicants' claimed invention. There is not even a mention in the Office Action of such a teaching by Brown.

Since the combination of Siamak, Carlson and Brown fails to describe, teach or suggest at least applicants' claimed element of automatically mapping a first identifier based on the physical structure of the machine being configured and on avoiding single points of failure or

single points of repair, applicants respectfully request an indication of allowability for independent claim 1.

Moreover, applicants respectfully submit that both Siamak and Carlson perform tasks for machines already installed. This is in contrast to applicants' claimed invention, in which the mapping is performed prior to installation of the machine. There is no description, teaching or suggestion in either of the references, alone or in combination, of automatically mapping a first identifier based on the physical structure of the machine being configured and on avoiding single points of failure or single points of repair, in which the automatically mapping is being performed prior to installation of the machine, as claimed by applicants. Further, Brown does not overcome the deficiencies of Siamak and Carlson.

Brown describes a method for configuring an upgraded administrative module computer. In particular, a technique is provided for defining a standard hardware and software configuration for an upgraded AM. A routine begins where a standard hardware and software mapping for TTY connections is defined. In particular, a TTY mapping may include a standard configuration of terminals and other types of TTY devices to be connected to the upgraded AM (see, e.g., col. 9, lines 15-21). Although Brown may be describing some configuration prior to installation, applicants respectfully submit that Brown is not describing, teaching or suggesting the particular mapping being performed by applicants prior to installation.

In particular, applicants are specifically reciting automatically mapping a first identifier of a resource of a machine being configured to a second identifier of the resource to assign a physical path of the resource to a logical path of the resource, wherein the automatically mapping is performed prior to installation of the machine, and wherein the first identifier is usable by hardware to identify the resource and the second identifier is usable by a program of the machine to identify the resource, and wherein the mapping is based on the physical structure of the machine being configured and on avoiding single points of failure or single points of repair. This specific recitation of what is being automatically performed prior to installation of the machine is not described in Brown, Siamak or Carlson, either alone or in combination. There is no description in any of the references of the specifically recited automatically mapping, as claimed by applicants. Since all of the references fail to describe, teach or suggest this element

of applicants' claimed invention, the combination also fails to describe, teach or suggest this element. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that their invention is patentable over the combination of Siamak, Carlson and Brown.

Further, the dependent claims are patentable for the same reasons as the independent claims, as well as for their own additional features. Moreover, the other cited art, Wilson, does not overcome the deficiencies of Siamak, Carlson, and Brown.

As one particular example, applicants respectfully submit that dependent claim 32 is patentable over the combination of Siamak, Carlson, Brown and Wilson. Dependent claim 32 recites that the another resource is a control unit, the resource is a channel, the first identifier is a physical channel identifier (PCHID) and the second identifier is a logical channel identifier (CHPID), and wherein the priority is assigned to the control unit by a user, and wherein the automatically mapping comprises first selecting the control unit with the highest priority and for that control unit, mapping a PCHID to a CHPID of a channel associated with the control unit. This is not described in Siamak, Carlson, Brown or Wilson, either alone or in combination.

It is explicitly admitted in the Office Action that Siamak, Carlson and Brown fail to disclose priority, and therefore, Wilson is relied upon. Wilson describes a reserved resource list that is used to prioritize the allocation of resource elements, in that the elements on the reserved resource list are not used until the other non-reserved resource elements are used. This is very different from applicants' claimed invention, in which the automatically mapping includes first selecting the control unit with the highest priority, and for that control unit, mapping a PCHID to a CHPID of the channel associated with that control unit. Such a mapping based on priority is not described, taught or suggested in Wilson. Since Siamak, Carlson, Brown and Wilson fail to describe, teach or suggest this aspect of applicants' claimed invention, applicants respectfully request an indication of allowability for dependent claim 32.

As a further example, dependent claim 33 specifically recites that the resource is a channel and the mapping is further based on the type of channel. Applicants respectfully submit that this is not described, taught or suggested in any of the cited references, either alone or in combination. Therefore, applicants respectfully request an indication of allowability for dependent claim 33.

For all of the above reasons, applicants respectfully request an indication of allowability for all pending claims.

Applicants respectfully request a telephonic interview with the Examiner to discuss any questions that the Examiner may have regarding this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Blanche E. Schiller
Blanche E. Schiller
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 35,670

Dated: January 9, 2009

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C.
5 Columbia Circle
Albany, New York 12203-5160
Telephone: (518) 452-5600
Facsimile: (518) 452-5579